REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-25, and 27-32 are pending. Claims 2 and 26 are cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 15 and 25 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

102 Rejection

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 18-22, 24-25 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pallman. Applicant respectfully submits that Pallman does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 13-15, 18-22, 24-25 and 28-32. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ...accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 4-9, 11, 13 and 14 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 18-22 and 24 depend from independent Claim 15, and Claims 28-32 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote

system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." By contrast, Pallman only discloses a method and apparatus for data communication (e.g., data acquisition and delivery). Along these lines, the Pallman reference teaches that modular software may be utilized to acquire/retrieve source data, deliver data to a target, or to perform processing of source data (see Abstract and column 27, lines 33-54). However, the Pallman reference is silent a teaching or suggestion readable on the system of protocol transformations that define the Applicants method for controlling remote systems that is recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25. Nowhere in the Pallman reference is it taught or suggested that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' invention as is recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 15 and 25 and as such, Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 4-9, 11 and 13-14 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 18-22 and

24 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 28-32 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 4-9, 11, 13-14, 18-22, 24, 28-32 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

103 Rejection

Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Blum et al. The Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Pallman reference nor the Blum et al. reference alone or in combination teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ... accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claims 15 and 25 recite limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-3 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 16-17 depend from independent Claim 15, and Claims 26-27 depend from independent Claim 25 and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Blum et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman noted above. Blum et al.

alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Blum et al. only discloses a transparent proxy server that facilitates the establishment of data communications between devices (see Abstract). The Blum et al. reference teaches that a transparent proxy application listening on a predetermined port may receive requests in the native protocol of the request and may operate to establish the requested communication (column 3, lines 42-58). Moreover, Blum et al. discloses that it is known in the art that an "encapsulation routine" may encapsulate an FTP command within an HTTP command and thereafter transmit the encapsulated command to a proxy server (column 1, lines 58 – 65). The server may then "strip the FTP command from the HTTP encapsulation before making a connection over the Internet in native FTP mode" (column 1, lines 58 – 67). By contrast, the Applicants' method as recited in Claims 1, 15, and 25 requires that commands be transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol. Nowhere in the Blum et al. reference is it taught that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman either alone or in combination with Blum et al. simply does not teach what the Examiner relies upon it as teaching and does not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' invention as is recited in Claims 1, 15, and 25.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 15 and 25, and thus Claims 1, 15 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Blum et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-3 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 16-17 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 26-27 dependent on Claim 25, and that Claims 2-3, 16-17, and 26-27 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 10 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Bowman-Amuah. Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Pallman reference nor the Bowman-Amuah reference alone or in combination teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 10 and 23. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ... accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claim 15 recites limitations similar to those that are recited in Claim 1. Claims 10 and

23 depend from independent Claims 1 and 15 respectively and recite further features of the present claimed invention.

Bowman-Amuah does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman. Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the step of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Bowman-Amuah only discloses a method for providing communication services over a computer network. Nowhere in the Bowman-Amuah reference is it taught that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted over the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman and Bowman-Amuah, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as is recited in Claims 1 and 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Bowman-Amuah alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1 and 15, and thus Claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Bowman-Amuah do not anticipate or

render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 10 dependent on Claim 1, and Claim 23 dependent on Claim 15, and that Claims 10 and 23 traverse the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pallman in view of Sridhar et al. Applicant respectfully submits that neither the Pallman reference nor the Sridhar et al. reference alone or in combination teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 12. The Examiner is respectfully directed to Claim 1 which sets forth a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including:

> ... accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system; executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

Claim 12 depends from independent Claims 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention.

Sridhar et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of Pallman. Sridhar et al. alone or in combination with Pallman does not anticipate or render obvious a method for controlling a remote system over the Internet by executing a command through File Transfer Protocol including the steps of "issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer

system; transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet; processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system." Sridhar et al. only discloses an enhanced network communication system where client and server communications systems are coupled over a data network. Nowhere in the Sridhar et al. reference is it taught that commands that are issued through a web browser and transmitted to the Internet as Hypertext Transfer Protocol be processed into a File Transfer Protocol command and forwarded to a remote system as is set forth in the Applicants' Claims. Consequently, Pallman and Sridhar et al., either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the Applicants' method for controlling a remote system over the Internet as it is recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Pallman and Sridhar et al. alone or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and thus Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Pallman and Sridhar et al. do not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 12 dependent on Claim 1, and that Claim 12 traverses the examiners basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: Apr. 13, 2003

James P. Hao
Registration No. 38,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

CLAIMS

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

Please amend the following Claim as shown below:

Please cancel Claims 2 and 26.

1. (Amended) A method for a local computer system to control a remote system over the Internet, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system;

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system;

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system;

executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; [and

issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program] issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system;

transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet;

processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and

forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.

3. (Amended) The method of Claim [2] 1, wherein the File Transfer Protocol command includes one of the commands for file creation, directory creation, file change, file removal, Unix file mode, user ownership change, group ownership change, and security permission.

15. (Amended) A server computer comprising:

an IP port which accepts FTP commands from a client computer system;

a processor coupled to the processor which executes the FTP commands;

a first memory coupled to the processor which contains a file system; and

a first memory coupled to the processor for storing an operating system, wherein the remote user issuing the FTP commands from the client computer can administer the file system, [wherein the IP port accepts a single script from the client computer system which causes the server computer to download a computer program from the server computer to the client computer system] and wherein further the FTP commands are derived from Hypertext Transfer Protocol commands that are transmitted over the Internet.

25. (Amended) A computer-readable medium having stored thereon instructions for implementing a remote computer systems management through an FTP Internet connection, comprising the steps of:

initiating a log-in procedure by the local computer system;

verifying whether a user is authorized to access the remote system;

accepting a command from an authorized user by the local computer system;

executing the command through File Transfer Protocol to perform a function on the remote system; [and

issuing a single script from the local computer system to command the remote system and to download data from the remote system, wherein the data downloaded from the remote system comprises a software program]

issuing the command through the web browser on the local computer system;

transmitting the command as Hypertext Transfer Protocol over the Internet;

processing the Hypertext Transfer Protocol command into a File Transfer Protocol command; and

forwarding the file Transfer Protocol command to the remote system.